Library Services and Technology Act

January 2007
Survey Results

A Report to the Utah State Library Division

by the
Department of Instructional Technology
Utah State University

Joanne P. H. Bentley, Ph.D.

Executive Summary

The following bulleted items are discussed in some depth in the report. They are presented here to provide an overview of the findings. The appendices include the instrument used, a summary report of the numerical data collected, and a full report of the qualitative data received. It should be noted that attitudes often change slowly over time and that many of the findings in this report are similar to previously reported attitudes of libraries in 2001.

- LSTA continues to provide the means for small to medium libraries to purchase technologies.
- The primary source of technology support is in-house and Utah State Library Division, but this varies by size of library.
- There is a strongly felt need for greater technology support in the libraries.
- The majority of libraries are comfortable with the amount of money from their budget which goes to technical support.
- 99% of respondents believe they are better able to answer patron questions because of increased library technology.
- Librarians project that they expect to rely upon state funding slightly more than federal funds for replacement of hardware and software upgrades.
- Librarians rate PIONEER highly in terms of current services and future projects.
- Training needs are clustered around in technology, library skills, and PIONEER.

Survey Results from Utah Public Libraries

The Utah State Library Division requested that the Instructional Technology Department at Utah State University conduct a follow-up survey to a series of focus group interviews it conducted in the fall of 2006. The interviews and survey both focus upon the Library Services and Technology Act which provides support to libraries in helping them acquire technology and provide technology-based services to their patrons.

The purpose of the survey was to determine the effects of technology enhancements on libraries and librarians as they relate to LSTA initiatives, to understand the future technology aspirations of libraries, to better understand training related issues, and to assess PIONEER: Utah's On-line Library. To accomplish this all public libraries in Utah were asked to respond to an online survey similar to the 2001 version but condensed and tailored to the new emphasis of LSTA for 2003-2006. A copy of the revised 2006 version of the survey questions can be found in Appendix A.

Findings are organized according to the following categories from the survey: Technology in the libraries (and technology's effects on the libraries); Technology support; Future directions; Future funding; PIONEER (Utah's Online Library); and Training associated issues. The report will provide data and charts to drive the points which are listed at the beginning of each section.

There was valuable help from the Utah State Library Division. Douglas Abrams provided invaluable direction, access to key people and a critical eye as the survey was developed and data gathered. Abbass Sharif was very competent in creating the online version of the survey and in generating the summary results from the database. Brooke Robertshaw's thematic analysis of the open ended responses was timely and complete. A special thank you to Melynda Fitt for editing this report.

Response Rates and Demographics

The 67% response rate to this survey provides us with confidence in the results. We sent out 136 letters inviting participation (academic library directors, 14; public library directors, 107; and school library-media center coordinators, 15) and received 91% respondents. A closer analysis shows that the composition of the responses does not necessarily reflect the exact composition of the population that was surveyed, the major differences being the over representation of the small and medium sized libraries, the slight under representation of the large public libraries and the absence of libraries at 2 year colleges. However, it is important to note that the response patterns were similar across library sizes. The following findings are therefore presented with confidence that they represent the larger Utah Public Library community.

In which kind of library do you work?		
	Response Percent	Response Total
Small public (Service population less than 10,000)	40.7%	37
Medium public (Service population 10,000 – 30,000)	15.4%	14
Large public (Service population 30,000+)	16.5%	15
Academic 1 (2 year institution)	0%	0
Academic 2 (4 year institution)	3.3%	3
Academic 3 (Research University)	2.2%	2
School library (School library community)	15.4%	14
Other (Prison, book mobile, etc)	6.6%	6
Total Respondents		91
(skipped this question)		0

Survey Findings

Technology Support

Eighty seven percent of librarians feel that they work in an environment of increasing work demands. In spite of this, 99% of them believe that they are better able to answer patron questions because of increased library technology. Generally, 75% of the people surveyed strongly felt the LSTA provided the ability to purchase technologies that would otherwise not have been acquired by libraries not supported by large academic institutions or more affluent communities. The investment in library equipment and software is positively affecting most libraries services. This theme recurs several times throughout this report.

One of the reasons for this perceived increase is prevalence of Internet research in our modern society. As in the 2001 survey report, it was noted that younger people seem to rely upon the Internet for everyday research. However, librarians are divided as to whether younger patrons or older patrons request assistance from library staff more often to use information technology. They were also somewhat divided as to whether older patrons were reluctant to use new information technology; however, over half feel that such is still the case to varying degrees.

Respondents were asked to rate the relative importance of various sources for technical support. In-house support was rated as extremely important by half of the respondents while USLD, local governments, and vendors were rated as very important to important by half the respondents. Volunteers, private sources and higher education IT support were not important sources to approximately half the respondents. The libraries rely most heavily upon in-house expertise in supporting technologies, and the larger the library is the more likely they are to rely upon in-house staff for technology support. Both medium and smaller libraries tend to rely upon private providers. There is both agreement and disagreement about volunteer support from the small libraries.   Larger libraries tend not to view volunteers as a source of support.

There is moderate agreement that more technical support is needed in the public libraries. There is clearly divided opinion about the libraries' abilities to hire new staff with technical skills, although there is agreement on the need to do so. Opinion is divided over whether technology is too costly for their library, however, a majority disagrees that "too much money from our budget goes to technology," which seems to indicate that the money spent on technology is deemed money well spent.

Over 80% of respondents feel that technical support should be handled in-house. The timeliness (how soon it takes for help to arrive) of technology support seems to be acceptable. There was a divided opinion among the respondents, but most seem to feel that support arrives in a timely manner. Small libraries are more critical of this than are medium and larger libraries.

Future Directions in Grant Activity

Several questions were asked about the future directions of the LSTA grant program. Respondents were asked how important certain areas were to their libraries. They were also asked how likely it was that they would request a grant in particular areas. The results are provided in the following two tables. The first table summarizes questions 17 - 21 which assess the *Importance* of future grant activity in each area. The second table summarizes questions 22 - 26 which assess the *Likelihood* of future grant activity in each area. Estimations of likelihood of requesting grants in any particular area generally follow the ranking of importance. However, it should be noted that there is more variance in the 2007 report than in the 2001 report. Some of this increase in variance may be accounted for in the separation of the importance section from likelihood in the layout of the questions.

All areas seemed to be of relative importance to some of the respondents with the notable exception for self-service checkout stations and service to institutionalized persons which were considerably lower than other choices. The three highest priorities as rated extremely important by the largest number of respondents were (1) adequate number of Internet workstations, (2) higher speed Internet connectivity, and (3) library lending.

17- 21. Please assess the *Importance* of grant activity areas listed below for the future of your library.						
	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Response Average
Basic Technology						
Library catalog software	39% (33)	24% (20)	13% (11)	12% (10)	12% (10)	2.33
Enhanced Technology						
Integrated library systems software	22% (18)	31% (26)	27% (22)	11% (9)	10% (8)	2.55
Self-service checkout station(s)	10% (8)	17% (14)	17% (14)	17% (14)	40% (34)	3.62
Library catalog on the web	45% (38)	23% (19)	13% (11)	8% (7)	11% (9)	2.17
Library website	36% (30)	30% (25)	17% (14)	8% (7)	10% (8)	2.26
Virtual (web-based) library services	25% (21)	24% (20)	24% (20)	18% (15)	8% (7)	2.60
Adequate # of Internet workstations	48% (41)	27% (23)	9% (8)	6% (5)	9% (8)	**2.01**
Higher speed Internet connectivity	51% (43)	20% (17)	13% (11)	5% (4)	12% (10)	**2.07**
Wireless network access in library	31% (26)	27% (23)	22% (19)	9% (8)	11% (9)	2.42
RFID security system	29% (24)	20% (17)	24% (20)	12% (10)	14% (12)	2.63
Cooperative Projects						
Share catalog access	23% (19)	24% (20)	21% (17)	18% (15)	13% (11)	2.74
Digitization projects	18% (15)	22% (18)	34% (28)	11% (9)	15% (12)	2.82
Eliminating Barriers to Library Service						
Foreign language services	23% (19)	15% (13)	33% (28)	19% (16)	10% (8)	2.77
Adaptive technology	18% (14)	26% (21)	32% (26)	15% (12)	9% (7)	2.71
Service to Institutionalized Persons	10% (8)	12% (10)	24% (19)	31% (25)	22% (18)	3.44
Service to Persons in Poverty	31% (26)	25% (21)	24% (20)	15% (13)	5% (4)	2.38
Service to Senior Citizens	25% (21)	33% (28)	25% (21)	6% (5)	11% (9)	2.44
Resource Sharing						
Library lending	42% (34)	33% (27)	14% (11)	4% (3)	7% (6)	**2.01**
OCLC support	29% (23)	35% (28)	20% (16)	10% (8)	6% (5)	2.30
Average Total Respondents 84						
Average (skipped these questions) 7						

22- 26. Please assess the *Likelihood* of grant activity areas listed below for the future of your library.						
	Extremely Likely	Very Likely	Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Likely	Response Average
Basic Technology						
Library catalog software	16% (13)	11% (9)	13% (11)	18% (15)	41% (34)	3.59
Enhanced Technology						
Integrated library systems software	10% (8)	16% (13)	16% (13)	22% (18)	36% (29)	3.58
Self-service checkout station(s)	8% (7)	5% (4)	10% (8)	19% (16)	58% (48)	4.13
Library catalog on the web	12% (10)	12% (10)	9% (7)	23% (19)	44% (36)	3.74
Library website	12% (10)	15% (12)	11% (9)	18% (15)	44% (36)	3.67
Virtual (web-based) library services	16% (13)	10% (8)	23% (19)	21% (17)	30% (25)	3.40
Adequate # of Internet workstations	34% (28)	16% (13)	11% (9)	12% (10)	27% (22)	2.82
Higher speed Internet connectivity	18% (15)	16% (13)	14% (12)	7% (6)	45% (37)	3.45
Wireless network access in library	22% (18)	16% (13)	11% (9)	10% (8)	42% (35)	3.35
RFID security system	20% (16)	11% (9)	13% (10)	18% (14)	38% (30)	3.42
Cooperative Projects						
Share Catalog Access	20% (16)	12% (10)	20% (16)	16% (13)	33% (27)	3.30
Digitization projects	19% (16)	11% (9)	24% (20)	13% (11)	33% (27)	3.29
Eliminating Barriers to Library Service						
Foreign language services	11% (9)	12% (10)	28% (23)	19% (16)	30% (25)	3.46
Adaptive technology	6% (5)	18% (15)	28% (23)	17% (14)	31% (26)	3.49
Service to Institutionalized Persons	0% (0)	10% (8)	12% (10)	19% (16)	60% (50)	4.29
Service to Persons in Poverty	9% (7)	15% (12)	26% (21)	21% (17)	30% (25)	3.50
Service to Senior Citizens	5% (4)	27% (22)	22% (18)	18% (15)	29% (24)	3.40
Resource Sharing						
Library lending	20% (17)	19% (16)	12% (10)	19% (16)	29% (24)	3.17
OCLC support	17% (14)	17% (14)	16% (13)	20% (16)	30% (24)	3.27
Average Total Respondents 83						
Average (skipped these questions) 8						

In the following table the listed averages reflect the likelihood of using funds for the listed expenditures. The lower the mean, the more likely funds would be used for the stated purpose. The most likely use of both federal and state funding according to this table is for the replacement of obsolete information technology hardware and the on-going update and improvement of software.

27- 32. Indicate how *Likely you are to use funds from* state or federal sources for each of the following.						
	Extremely Likely	Very Likely	Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Likely	Response Average
Federal Funding						
Implementation of web-hosted software applications	12% (10)	16.9% (14)	16.9% (14)	14.5% (12)	39.8% (33)	3.53
The replacement of obsolete information technology hardware	25% (21)	21.7% (18)	7.2% (6)	15.7% (13)	30.1% (25)	3.04
The on-going update and improvement of software	20.5% (17)	20.5% (17)	10.8% (9)	2.17% (18)	26.5% (22)	3.13
State Funding						
Implementation of web-hosted software applications	15.5% (13)	17.9% (15)	25% (21)	16.7% (14)	25% (21)	3.17
The replacement of obsolete information technology hardware	22.9% (19)	26.5% (22)	20.5% (17)	10.8% (9)	19.3% (16)	2.77
The on-going update and improvement of software	21% (17)	22.2% (18)	25.9% (21)	9.9% (8)	21% (17)	2.87
Average Total Respondents 83						
(Average skipped this question) 8						

The following table records the average importance of items that participants were asked to rate in terms of future support from LSTA funding. Note that all averages were extremely close with very little distance between them. Rather than looking at the increments in this table, it may be more profitable to view the top of the list and the bottom of the list to view the relative importance between the higher and the lower rated activities. (The lower the average response, the more important the item.)

33. Assess the importance of using LSTA funding in the future to support these new opportunities.						
	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Response Average
Statewide Virtual Union Catalog	15% (12)	18% (14)	31% (25)	19% (15)	18% (14)	3.06
Small-medium library cataloging assistance	19% (15)	25% (20)	28% (23)	16% (13)	12% (10)	2.79
Courier service (resource sharing)	15% (12)	15% (12)	23% (18)	23% (18)	23% (18)	3.23
Enhanced continuing education	23% (19)	38% (31)	26% (21)	5% (4)	9% (7)	2.38
Technology for distance Continuing Ed	19% (15)	41% (33)	22% (18)	5% (4)	14% (11)	2.54
Children / Youth Services	32% (26)	32% (26)	23% (19)	7% (6)	5% (4)	2.21
Services to Latinos & other ethnic groups	20% (16)	28% (23)	33% (27)	14% (11)	5% (4)	2.56
Subsidies for IT support	23% (19)	22% (18)	30% (24)	11% (9)	14% (11)	2.69
New telecommunications infrastructure	22% (18)	25% (20)	27% (22)	14% (11)	12% (10)	2.69
Expansion of Competitive Grants	24% (19)	36% (28)	32% (25)	6% (5)	1% (1)	2.24
Addition of new premium databases to Public PIONEER	47% (38)	32% (26)	17% (14)	4% (3)	0% (0)	1.78
				Total Respondents	82	
				(skipped this question)	9	

PIONEER is viewed by librarians in the state as an important resource that should be supported by future programs. Additionally, more emphasis on children/youth services and expansion of competitive grants was deemed to be two important areas of potential expansion for future LSTA funding. Although all the averages were close, the least important area of possible expansion for LSTA was the statewide virtual union catalog.

PIONEER: Utah's Online Library

A number of questions were asked that dealt with PIONEER services and ratings of various aspects of PIONEER features. As reported in the 2001 report, there was again strong agreement that PIONEER has equalized the services offered by public libraries and that it is integral to the services the local library delivers to its patrons. PIONEER also expands access to periodicals that would normally be unaffordable to most libraries. When asked if

libraries had reduced the number of periodical subscriptions because of PIONEER over 50% agreed that they had, however, almost 30% disagreed which appears to be consistent with previous report trends for both periodicals and reference collections. There were no differences among the libraries by size. While over 48% agreed that PIONEER was well known by patrons, over 50% were either undecided or disagreed with the statement suggesting that there is still much work to be done to educate the public concerning PIONEER.

Librarians were asked to rate several functions and aspects of PIONEER in a continued effort to determine what kind of improvements might be made. The following table lists in descending order those aspects of PIONEER that were listed on the survey instrument. It should be noted that all of the listed aspects or functions of PIONEER were rated over a larger spread than in the 2001 report but again with very small differences between average responses. This indicates more variance in the perception of quality but the same general consensus of the value of services it provides as well as the way it is laid out.

42. If you use the Public PIONEER web site, please rate each of the features of Public PIONEER.						
	Excellent	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	Unacceptable	Average
Use as a library home page	33% (19)	37% (21)	21% (12)	5% (3)	4% (2)	2.09
Friendliness or usability	26% (20)	42% (32)	25% (19)	8% (6)	0% (0)	2.14
Well designed and attractive	30% (23)	42% (32)	24% (18)	3% (2)	1% (1)	2.03
Well organized	27% (20)	47% (34)	21% (15)	5% (4)	0% (0)	2.04
Access to a diversity of information: commercial & free	34% (25)	47% (35)	19% (14)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1.85
Frequently up-dated	35% (25)	50% (36)	12% (9)	3% (2)	0% (0)	1.83
				Total Respondents	78	
				(skipped this question)	13	

Training Issues

Respondents were asked to rate a listing of training opportunities and training characteristics. The training opportunities are presented in ascending rank order (1 = Extremely Important). The number of respondents which scored the item Extremely Important, Very Important, and Important was also considered in the interpretation.

43. Please rate the following possible training opportunities.						
	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Response Average
Training in library skills	42% (33)	36% (28)	14% (11)	4% (3)	4% (3)	1.91
Training in computer technologies	48% (37)	31% (24)	12% (9)	6% (5)	3% (2)	1.84
Training in MS Publisher (to create publicity, etc.)	15% (11)	24% (18)	33% (25)	19% (14)	9% (7)	2.84
Training in new communication methods (blogs, podcasting)	24% (18)	22% (17)	33% (25)	16% (12)	5% (4)	2.57
Training in personnel management	23% (18)	32% (25)	27% (21)	12% (9)	5% (4)	2.43
Training in marketing your library	25% (19)	38% (29)	19% (15)	14% (11)	4% (3)	2.35
Training in grant writing and/or management	26% (20)	29% (22)	26% (20)	14% (11)	5% (4)	2.44
Training in dealing with local politics	22% (17)	21% (16)	29% (22)	22% (17)	6% (5)	2.70
Refresher courses for UPLIFT grads	31% (23)	23% (17)	15% (11)	18% (13)	14% (10)	2.59
Training in the use of Public PIONEER premium databases	38% (29)	35% (27)	16% (12)	8% (6)	4% (3)	2.05
				Total Respondents	78	
				(skipped this question)	13	

Training in computer skills and training in library skills were rated equally high. This finding seems to indicate the need for more comprehensive training in both the technology area and library skills as computer skills become more integrated into the heart of library work. Training in the use of Public PIONEER premium databases came in as a close second.

There was also expressed a strong interest and desire for more technical training across a variety of skills including: MS Publisher (to create publicity, etc.), new communication methods such as blogs, podcasting, etc., personnel management, marketing your library, grant writing and/or management, dealing with local politics, and refresher courses for UPLIFT graduates.

Qualitative Themes

Several themes emerged from the open ended comments in the survey, namely (1) the LSTA serves a useful purpose for most libraries in the State and it is particularly useful

for rural and small libraries, (2) comments about the grants process and use, and (3) questions about LSTA specifically.

Common themes identified by comments from survey respondents include:

- The usefulness of the LSTA monies and the benefits to the citizens of the recipient communities
- The updated technology the LSTA monies provides small and rural communities
- PIONEER is a valuable and essential service that provides resources that otherwise would not be accessed
- The training by the LSTA is very beneficial to both professional and non-professional library personnel
- Frustration with the LSTA grant qualification and judging process; wanting feedback for grants that were turned down to improve the process
- Availability of funds for non-technological purchases

For a complete list of comments made by survey respondents, consult Appendix C.

Summary

The library community continues to value PIONEER. It scored highest when individuals were asked to rate several new initiatives involving technology and library services. When librarians were asked to rate the importance of future activities and forecast the likelihood that they would write grants in particular areas, they rated three areas as extremely important: (1) adequate number of Internet workstations, (2) higher speed Internet connectivity, and (3) library lending as the highest areas of importance. All of the above data demonstrate that PIONEER should continue to be a major part of or a focus of any future plans that deal with technology and library services.

Appendix A

2006 Survey Instrument

Library Services and Technology Act Program Survey

The Utah State Library has asked the Instructional Technology Department at Utah State University to conduct a survey about the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA). The following survey is intended to gather opinions about issues that libraries face and about the LSTA program. We are not looking for any particularly correct answer, just thoughts and reactions. Please be candid and react to the items below.

We intend that the results of this survey will help us provide better services to you. Results will be reported to the State Library, the State Library Board, and the Utah LSTA Advisory Council as they complete the evaluation of Utah's 5-Year (2003-2007) LSTA Library Programs Plan. The results will also be used to assist them in formulating a new LSTA 5-Year Plan (2008-2012).

Please follow the directions carefully and offer your opinions. It should take about 30 minutes for you and/or your staff to respond. Please return your official site response on the colored copy provided or go to http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=766562934273 to complete it online. Thank you in advance for your time and help. Your opinions are very important and will help us as we plan for the next few years.

SECTION I: Respondent Description

The following questions are intended to help us better understand a bit about you and will help us organize the total responses to the questions about LSTA.

1.   Please enter the name of the library site responding on the line below:
        _____.

2.   Please indicate who was involved in responding to this questionnaire by checking all that apply:
        a. ___ Library director /Branch manager
        b. ___ Library staff
        c. ___ Library trustee
        d. ___ Other (Please Specify) _____

3. Please enter the total number of people that participated in developing this response:
    _____.

4. In which kind of library do you work?
        a. Small public (service population less than 10,000)
        b. Medium public (service population 10,000 – 30,000)
        c. Large public (service population 30,000+)
        d. Academic (2 year)
        e. Academic (4 year)
        f.   Academic (Research University)
        g. School library (school library community)
        h. Other (specify) _____

SECTION II: Technology in Libraries

*Over the past few years, a number of changes have occurred in libraries due to **the impact of library technology**. Below are some statements that relate to these changes. Please react to them by circling the response that most closely fits your feelings.*

5. Because of library technology, as staff members, we can better service our public.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

6. Over the last five years, the workload of our library staff has increased substantially.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

7. Younger patrons rely upon the Internet for research.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

8. Younger patrons do not request help from the library staff as much as do older patrons.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

9. Older patrons are reluctant to use new information (computer) technology.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

10. LSTA grants have enabled our library to acquire technologies that otherwise we could not afford.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

*In the following list, please rank the importance of each **source of technology maintenance and support services** to your library by circling the number that corresponds to the level of importance.*

		Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
11.	In-house (library) IT support staff	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Local government (city or county) IT support staff	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Local school district IT support staff	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Campus IT support service	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Private service provider	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Utah State Library Division staff	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Volunteers	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Vendor software or hardware maintenance on annual agreements.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Vendor web-hosted applications & maintenance of software and hardware.	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Other_____ (please list)	5	4	3	2	1

*Below are statements that relate to **technology support**. Please react to each one by circling the response that best describes your feelings.*

21. Our library needs more technical (computer systems) support.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

22. We have been able to hire new staff members who have technical computer skills.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

23. Technical support of our library's computer systems is too costly for our library.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

24. Too much money from our budget goes to technology.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

25. Technical support of the library's computer system is better handled by a third party.

Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Undecided 3
Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	

26. Whenever we have a technology problem, we have to wait too long for help to arrive.

Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Undecided 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1

SECTION III: Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA): Future Directions

*Please assess the **importance of the grant activity areas** listed below for the future of your library, and the **likelihood** that your library will request a grant in this area. Please use both scales for each question.*

	Importance					Likelihood				
	Extremely Important				Not Important	Extremely Likely				Not Likely

Competitive Grants

Basic technology

	Importance					Likelihood				
27. Library catalog software	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Enhanced technology

	Importance					Likelihood				
28. Integrated library systems software	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
29. Self-service checkout station(s)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
30. Library catalog on the web	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
31. Library website	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
32. Virtual (web-based) library services	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
33. Adequate # of Internet workstations	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
34. Higher speed Internet connectivity	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
35. Wireless network access in library	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
36. RFID security system	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
37. Other specialized software Please Specify _____	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Cooperative Projects

	Importance					Likelihood				
38. Shared catalog access	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
39. Digitization projects	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
40. Other (specify) _____	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Eliminating Barriers to Library Service

	Importance					Likelihood				
41. Foreign language services	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
42. Adaptive Technology	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
43. Service to institutionalized persons	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
44. Service to persons in poverty	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

45.	Service to senior citizens	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
46.	Other (please specify)_____	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Non-Competitive Grants

Resource Sharing

47.	Library lending	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
48.	OCLC support	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

*Please indicate below the **future likelihood of using funds from state or federal sources** for each of the following purposes*

49.   Implementation of web-hosted software applications.

	Federal Funds			**State Funds**	
Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All	Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All
5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

50.   The replacement of obsolete information technology hardware

	Federal Funds			**State Funds**	
Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All	Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All
5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

51.   The on-going update and improvement of software.

	Federal Funds			**State Funds**	
Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All	Extremely Likely		Not Likely At All
5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

*The following is a list of **potential purposes** for future federal funding. It is intended simply to **initiate** and **focus** a broad-based dialogue within the Utah library community regarding the future use of federal dollars distributed by the State Library for state-wide services.*

*Please assess the **importance of using LSTA funding in the future** to support these **possible** new opportunities.*

		Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
52.	Statewide Virtual Union Catalog	5	4	3	2	1
53.	Small-medium library cataloging assistance	5	4	3	2	1
54.	Courier service (resource sharing)	5	4	3	2	1
55.	Enhanced continuing education	5	4	3	2	1
56.	Technology for distance Continuing Ed	5	4	3	2	1
57.	Children / Youth Services	5	4	3	2	1
58.	Services to Latinos & other ethnic groups	5	4	3	2	1
59.	Subsidies for IT support	5	4	3	2	1
60.	New telecommunications infrastructure	5	4	3	2	1
61.	Expansion of Competitive Grants	5	4	3	2	1
62.	Addition of new premium databases to *Public PIONEER*	5	4	3	2	1
63.	Other _____	5	4	3	2	1

*The next two sections deal with the **Public Pioneer website**. If you **do not use** this service in your library, please check the box below and skip forward to the last question.*

We do not use the Public Pioneer website in our library: ☐

*If you **do use the** Public Pioneer website, please proceed in completing the next two sections.*

SECTION IV: PIONEER: Utah's Online Library

The following questions deal with the Internet and PIONEER: Utah's Online Library, *specifically the* Public PIONEER *web site (http://pioneer.utah.gov) maintained by the State Library Division. Please react to them as you consider* Public PIONEER *and its use in your library*.

Following are some **statements about** **Public PIONEER** *databases. Please react to them by circling the best response that describes your opinion or feelings*.

64. *Public PIONEER* equalizes availability of some types of information for public libraries throughout the state.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

65. *Public PIONEER* is well designed for searches.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

66. *Public PIONEER* is an integral part of our library's services to our patrons.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

67. We could not afford the periodicals to which *Public PIONEER* provides access.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

68. As a result of *Public PIONEER*, we have reduced the number of periodicals to which we subscribe.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

69. As a result of Public PIONEER, we have reduced the size of our reference collection(s).

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

70. *Public PIONEER* is well known among our patrons.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

IF you use the Public PIONEER web site, please rate each of the features of **Public PIONEER**. *If you cannot rate an item, or the item does not apply to your library, please leave the item blank.*

	Excellent	Very Good	Adequate	Poor	Unacceptable
71. Use as a library home page	5	4	3	2	1
72. Friendliness or usability	5	4	3	2	1
73. Well designed and attractive	5	4	3	2	1
74. Well organized	5	4	3	2	1
75. Access to a diversity of information--both commercial databases and free web sites	5	4	3	2	1
76. Frequently up-dated	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION V: Training Issues

*Please rate the following possible **training opportunities and training characteristics**. Please react to each one.*

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
78. Training in library skills	5	4	3	2	1
79. Training in computer technologies	5	4	3	2	1
80. Training in MS Publisher (to create publicity, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
81. Training in new communication methods (blogs, podcasting, etc)	5	4	3	2	1
82. Training in personnel management	5	4	3	2	1
83. Training in marketing your library	5	4	3	2	1
84. Training in grant writing/management	5	4	3	2	1
85. Training in dealing with local politics	5	4	3	2	1
86. Refresher courses for UPLIFT grads	5	4	3	2	1
87. Training in the use of *Public PIONEER* premium databases	5	4	3	2	1
88. Other (specify) _____	5	4	3	2	1

89. Please add any additional comments or observations you have on the administration of LSTA dollars to the back of this sheet.

Thank you for your time and your help in completing this questionnaire. Your opinion is important and we will consider your reactions as the state library makes its plans for the future. Please return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided.

Appendix B

Summary Data Report

Also available at

http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=293427371877

Appendix C

Qualitative Thematic Data

Additional comments on the administration of LSTA dollars	
Theme	Comments
Libraries don't know about LSTA.	I don't think school libraries have realized how useful the LSTA dollars could be for them.
Training is beneficial.	The funds we have used for training non-professional library personal has been very beneficial. Information on how to prepare grant was excellent. Assistance from Jane Smith was excellent. The state has been great to provide our staff so many opportunities for training and growth, and our city deeply appreciates it.
The LSTA has helped with resources.	The LSTA grants are very beneficial to the state of Utah. Many library related projects which benefit all citizens of the state would simply not be available without these funds. Here at Westminster College we would not have our Assistive Technology Lab without the LSTA funding we received. We are also able to preserve and share a vital part of Utah's education history due to the grant we presently have to digitize historical photographs and documents regarding the early history of Westminster College. We would not be able to do this without LSTA funds. LSTA and the grants have been invaluable in allowing our city to provide the level of service and technology we have to our community. Without LSTA grants we would not be able to have the number of computers that we have or be able to upgrade. We appreciate the support we receive from the State Library. We could not function without it. Much needed and many thanks to our state library. Thank you so much for the wonderful support you have been in the past in granting us LSTA dollars. The LSTA grant we received has made a world of difference to the students at our school. I applaud the committee for looking at each individual grant request, as I know how much time this takes. LSTA funding is the catalyst for innovation in the State of Utah. By serving all libraries, it benefits every citizen. LSTA funds have greatly improved our library this past year. I hope that we can put them to work for us again in the very near future. Over the past 10 years the LSTA program has greatly

	improved our ability to keep pace with neighboring libraries who have more financial, technical, and human resources. It has truly leveled the library service playing field within Salt Lake county.
	This library probably would not have been able to get technology without LSTA dollars. A lot of the maintenance we do to keep everything going is donated by knowledgeable citizens who like to help the library. We are lucky.
The LSTA helps with rural communities and small libraries.	Since we are a small library, we rely on LSTA to help keep us updated. We need and appreciate the help that we receive. Please continue to support the rural communities as well as the cities.
	A major benefit to rural libraries that don't have a large revenue base.
	LSTA dollars are going to be important to help smaller libraries expand and modernize.
	Without the availability of these funds our small library and it's even smaller budget would not be able to accomplish nearly what we do. We desperately need LSTA dollars.
	I recently attended a discussion group of small library directors. We all agreed that we could not offer the updated technology if we depended only on our city budgets. Our small communities just don't have the resources. We would not be able to serve the public as we do without the LSTA funding.
Dependence on the LSTA is difficult.	We would be in the stone ages in technology, if it were not for LSTA grants and I'm not pleased about our dependence on it.
	It is an unfortunate trend that many libraries must use LSTA funds to keep their integrated library systems updated, and that these "catch 22" situations require such a large cut of the LSTA pie. It is a great thing that LSTA funds can be used for digitization projects such as the historic newspapers project.
There were problems with the grant process.	I have hated the competitive grant process. It seems that it comes down to who is better at presenting than who really needs the grant. I feel very uncomfortable in applying for the LSTA Grants, to be very honest. The last time I applied I felt demeaned by the process.
	Being able to see other competitors present was very informative & helpful. Opportunity to present in both written & verbal form was very fair. Having library directors add comments when judging of dollar division was very bad. It was obvious who knew the judges, who were seasoned directors, and who were good at public speaking. This became an exercise in lobbying. Our presenter felt very strongly that once presentation was made, "judges" should make decision w/out additional comments from the floor.
	We have applied twice in recent rounds for mini-grants, and

	both times we were turned down. We received notification that these were denied but would liked to have received a more in-depth explanation of why we were turned down.
Pioneer is a useful service that provides services that we couldn't otherwise provide to our users	PIONEER is the best bang for the buck state dollars can buy. Additional databases would be welcomed. Although not all of our patrons know about PIONEER, the word is spreading and library patrons who use it consider it a worthy use of tax monies. As a mid-size, stand alone library serving a population of 89,000, Orem is neither a small town library, a large library, or part of a library system. While the addition of new databases to PIONEER is needed and appreciated, the current trend of state access to a database being dependent on upon libraries the size of Orem and larger paying their own subscription rates is a troubling one. We don't have the budget larger libraries and library systems have to subscribe to expensive databases. Pioneer Library is a core essential service for our access to information. Keep it up!! There is so much information on the Pioneer web site. There is so much more to learn. The databases provided on PIONEER are invaluable to the students in our school. I still try to update the reference section, but I do not receive the funds needed to purchase those terrific sources.
Suggestions for improvement.	I would advocate for maintaining a high level of funding for the competitive grant program which has a demonstrated history of effectively targeting local needs rather than shifting funds for centralized services such as CE, resource sharing, or courier service.
Questions	I have wondered for some time if there could be a mechanism that would support the use LSTA funding to enhance decision-making on the part of local government entities. For example, the Weber County Library System hired an independent program auditor to review our technology services and report to the Board and County Commission. While the independent audit had the potential to give the Library a "black eye," the oppostie was the result, strengthening our grip on our ability to deliver technology services without interference from other County departments. Could LSTA money be used for a state-wide technology audit, giving each library administrator and board the benefit of a solid analysis upon which to base their technology planning? Have recently been notified that we do not qualify for LSTA funding due to non-certification. Previously told that we did certify through our Bookmobile. Conflicting/confusing information given to our library that previously did receive such funding.
We do not receive funding.	We are a small branch and we rely on the Main Branch of the Washington County a lot. As far as grants, we do not see any

	of the grant money that I know of. the technology work is done through the IT department and we don't have much to do with it so my answers might be of value as far as the LSTA Program is concerned. We have no current plans to apply for an LSTA grant, but that is due partly to the funding and support we already receive from the Utah State Library.
Combination of things.	After reading the survey I realize that school library problems are very different from the questions asked except about PIONEER. Several years ago I applied for a grant from LSTA. I only received a small amount of help. I think it was because I was asking for technology that was not known by those that would read and award the grant. It is very important that the differences between public and school libraries are noted. I TEACH and I support all teachers and their curriculum. Checking out materials is only a portion of my job. The technology I need is to help me and other teachers teach. Information technology is vitally important for all students. This can be taught with more success by using all types of technology, not just a computer with fast internet. Thanks for the Pioneer databases and I hope they can continue. Without them, teaching research skills would be extremely difficult. Thanks
Need help with non-technical resources.	I would like to see LSTA funds available for purchasing materials, not just technology. And I would like to see LSTA funds available for bookmobiles (our patrons are taxpayers too and should have access to these funds like anyone else).